

never abandons his hold until he falls off exhausted by repletion and satiety. But I desist. Why declaim against the quack? As I before remarked with regard to the demagogue, so I repeat with regard to the quack. He, too, is only the creature of the people. If he flourishes in any community, it is because he is demanded by that community. He can no more flourish in a community unsuited to him, than corn or wheat can germinate and mature in a soil unsuited for their growth. The people are too potential for it to be otherwise. Are not their demands, wishes, whims and caprices always consulted,—gratified and even anticipated? When France called for a guillotine, and Rome, for a thumb-screw, a boot and a rack, the mechanics vied with each other in supplying the demands. When England demanded a Cromwell, and Mexico a Santa Anna, they were both immediately forthcoming. Thus we see that public men are, generally, the creature of circumstance and the people: and we may declaim against the demagogue and the quack, *et id omne genus*, until our heads grow gray, but it will avail nothing, we only strike at the effect while the cause remains intact. As well might we attempt to stop the current of the Mississippi by damming up its waters, while its fountain springs were allowed to flow on, as to root out the demagogue and quack without reforming the people. But give the people light and knowledge, and above all, virtue and religion; and you will see these parasites extirpated root and branch, as noxious weeds, before the scientific husbandman, or they will migrate, as birds of passage, to more genial climes.

But, in shunning one evil, the people often fall into another and an opposite one. If quackery is a blight and a mill-dew upon the face of society, genuine and complete